DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 299 RC 016 937

AUTHOR Fletcher, Richard K. Jr.; And Others
TITLE Strategies and Effectiveness of Rural Schools/University Collaborations.
INSTITUTION Tennessee Technological Univ., Cookeville. Rural Education Research and Service Consortium.
PUB DATE Sep 88
NOTE 68p.; Paper presented at the National Rural Education Association Conference (80th, Bismarck, ND, September 24-28, 1988). For related document, see ED 289 639.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Regional Characteristics; Rural Education; *Rural Schools; *School Effectiveness; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Good Schools Project (Kappa Delta Pi); *Tennessee (Upper Cumberland)

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the findings of a study of the effectiveness of collaboration between the Rural Education Research and Service Consortium at Tennessee Technological University and rural schools in its service area. The study uses the instrumentation and research design of the Good Schools Project (GSP) initiated by Kappa Delta Pi in 1984. Baseline data collected in 1986 using the GSP structure are compared to data collected in spring 1988. Data were gathered by the consortium and analyzed in 11 conceptual dimensions: demographics, curriculum perspectives, goal attainment, classroom practices, interpersonal relations, commitment, discipline and safety, support services and facilities, decision-making, history, and achievement scores. Between the time of the baseline data collection and the spring of 1988, strategies directed at areas of indicated weaknesses were implemented in 12 of the 40 schools from which baseline data were collected. This research report discusses both positive and negative changes. The 1988 sample included 9 of 40 schools used in the 1986 study. Numerous tables present the percentages of responses for the GSP sample, the Middle Tennessee Region 1986 sample, and the Middle Tennessee Region 1988 sample. The chi square test is reported on the tables. The report concludes that, although the study was originally designed to measure the impact of collaboration on rural school effectiveness, it has become instead a measure of the impact of state mandates and principal leadership on rural schools. (ALL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303299

Strategies and Effectiveness of Rural Schools/University Collaborations

A Paper

Presented by

Dr. Richard K. Fletcher, Jr., Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

and

Dr. Margaret S. Phelps, Director
Rural Education Research and Service Consortium

and

Dr. Elmer Gene Talbert, Coordinator
Education Support Services

Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, Tennessee 38505

at

The National Rural Education
80th Annual Conference

Bismarck, North Dakota

September 24-28, 1988

RC016937

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. K. Fletcher, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS/TABLES

PAGE NUMBER

INTRODUCTION..... 1

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS..... 5

TABLE T-1 CURRICULUM PERSPECTIVES..... 6

TABLE S-1 CURRICULUM PERSPECTIVES..... 11

TABLE T-2 GOAL ATTAINMENT..... 13

TABLE S-2 GOAL ATTAINMENT..... 15

TABLE T-3 CLASSROOM PRACTICES..... 17

TABLE S-3 CLASSROOM PRACTICES..... 21

TABLE T-4 DECISION MAKING..... 26

TABLE S-4 DECISION MAKING..... 33

TABLE T-5 SUPPORT SERVICES AND FACILITIES..... 34

TABLE T-6 COMMITMENT..... 36

TABLE S-6 COMMITMENT..... 42

TABLE T-7 DISCIPLINE AND SAFETY..... 44

TABLE S-7 DISCIPLINE AND SAFETY..... 47

TABLE T-8 INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS..... 50

TABLE S-8 INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS..... 54

DISCUSSION OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES..... 58

- Curriculum Perspectives..... 58
- Goal Attainment..... 59
- Classroom Practices..... 59
- Decision Making..... 60
- Support Services and Facilities..... 61
- Commitment..... 61
- Discipline and Safety..... 61
- Interpersonal Relations..... 62

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS..... 62

REFERENCES..... 64

ABSTRACT

Strategies and Effectiveness of Rural Schools/University Collaborations

The Rural Education Research and Service Consortium at Tennessee Technological University has engaged in a variety of collaborative efforts with a dozen rural schools in its service area over the past four years. The process of rural school/university collaboration has evolved into various strategies for impacting rural school effectiveness while meeting the research and service demands of the University.

Baseline data reflecting the effectiveness of rural schools in the Upper Cumberland region of Tennessee were collected and analyzed in a report by these authors which included comparisons of teacher and student responses from forty rural schools from this region with those of teachers and students included in Kappa Delta Pi's Good Schools Project. Subsequent to collecting the baseline data, strategies were implemented in a dozen of the schools which were directed at areas of indicated weaknesses. The same instruments were administered again to both students and teachers in 1988. This research report discusses the changes, both positive and negative, which the authors construe as related to the impact of the strategies which have been implemented.

The period of time included in the study of rural schools/ university collaborations has been one of tremendous school change in Tennessee. The State has mandated numerous reforms including a Career Ladder Program for teachers, state curriculum guides, required achievement testing, competency based programs in many subject areas, publication of School Success Report Cards for each school system, and other measures designed to standardize the public school experience. In addition, in the particular schools included in this study, two were consolidated and five changed principals. Consequently it appears that the study which was designed at its inception to measure the impact of collaboration on rural school effectiveness has become instead a measure of the impact of state mandates and principal leadership on rural schools. On items dealing with issues addressed by state mandates, each of the schools studied tended to shift in the same direction. On items reflecting leadership initiatives of the building principal, some schools showed great improvement and others showed the opposite. This resulted in several survey items showing both positive and negative shifts away from earlier more neutral responses.

INTRODUCTION

How effective are rural schools in meeting the needs of youth? How does one determine the effectiveness of a rural school? How do rural schools in a particular region compare with effective schools across the nation? These were some of the questions facing the Tennessee Technological University Rural Education Research and Service Consortium (RERSC) when it was formed in 1984. The mission of RERSC is to facilitate research and service activities of the University's teacher education faculty in rural schools and to launch a major research thrust consistent with the provisions of the Tennessee Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984 (CERA) and the national emphasis on effective schools and effective teaching. One of the first goals of the Consortium was the collection of a broad base of data to be used in determining the level of effectiveness of schools in the Upper Cumberland region of Tennessee and to identify variables for school improvement projects.

The process of rural school/university collaboration has evolved into various strategies for impacting rural school effectiveness while meeting the research and service demands of the University. Baseline data reflecting the effectiveness of rural schools in the Upper Cumberland region of Tennessee were collected and analyzed in a report by these authors (Talbert, 1987) which included comparisons of teacher and student responses from forty rural schools from this region with those of teachers

and students included in Kappa Delta Pi's Good Schools Project. (Frymier, 1984) The GSP included 106 schools from throughout the nation which had been identified by the project committee as "good schools" based on nominations from Kappa Delta Pi members. Principals, teachers and students in each school were surveyed, and selected school personnel, students and parents were interviewed. Data were gathered and analyzed with respect to eleven conceptual dimensions: demographics, curriculum perspectives, goal attainment, classroom practices, interpersonal relations, commitment, discipline and safety, support services and facilities, decision making, history, and achievement scores.

Because the GSP data were current, included a broad base of information, and were based on a national sample, they were selected for comparison with baseline information on rural schools in the TTU service area. Permission was secured from Kappa Delta Pi to use the GSP instrumentation and research design.

The period of time included in the study of rural schools/university collaborations has been one of tremendous school change in Tennessee. The State has mandated numerous reforms including a Career Ladder Program for teachers, state curriculum guides, required achievement testing, competency based programs in many subject areas, publication of School Success Report Cards for each school system, and other measures designed to standardize the public school experience. In addition, in the particular schools included in this study, two

were consolidated and five changed principals. Concurrent with the state and local changes occurring in these schools, the TTU Rural Education Research and Service Consortium initiated a variety of school-based research/service projects in the member schools. The strategies used varied from school to school depending on the perceived needs of individual schools and the availability of resources.

Teachers in each member school were provided access to a professional growth program which provided for their spending a day visiting another school without loss of pay. The program provided either a TTU professor to serve as substitute or reimbursed the school for the substitute and paid expenses incurred in the visit. Other programs implemented in one or more of the member schools included specialized courses for teachers, an elementary school music teacher, use of art methods students to teach art, a resource teacher in art, a resource teacher in elementary science, storytelling in K-2, children's literature in 3-6, creative writing using word processing, study skills training, higher order thinking instruction, a middle school band program, parent education, science enrichment, concert series, theatrical productions, and student clubs. Many of these activities were funded externally as a result of proposals written by the Rural Education faculty.

In the spring of 1988, the Kappa Delta Pi Good Schools instrumentation was readministered in nine of the member schools. Subsequent to collecting the baseline data, strategies were

implemented in a dozen of the schools which were directed at areas of indicated weaknesses. The same instruments were administered again in selected schools to both students and teachers in 1988. This research report discusses the changes, both positive and negative, which the authors construe as related to the impact of the strategies which have been implemented.

Faculty from the Rural Education Research and Service Consortium at Tennessee Technological University have assisted rural schools in acquiring grants relating to dropout prevention, providing free inservice and course opportunities for teachers, provided personnel in band, music, and art and have been instrumental in providing physics by sattelite to schools which otherwise would have had limited programs in physics. Some of the specific questions which reflect the thrust of this proposal are whether provisions for exemplary interactive growth experiences for teachers, special enrichment programs for elementary and secondary students such as art and music teachers, and providing physics by sattelite change the quality of the rural schools, thus reflecting better ratings on the assessment instruments used in the Good Schools Project.

This session is a presentation of statistical and graphical analysis which reflect the effectiveness of the strategies used to improve rural schools in Tennessee through the collaborative effort between faculty in the Rural Education Research and Service Consortium and key administrators and teachers in these rural schools. The baseline data from the Good Schools Project

(GSP) of a national sample of one hundred schools are included in the statistical TABLEs as a point of comparative reference only. The chi squared test was employed to determine whether any statistically significant changes were made between the 1986 and 1988 assessments which used the two hundred item (GSP) survey for teachers and one hundred item (GSP) survey for students. (Frymier, 1984)

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The sample for this study included 9 of 40 schools used in the earlier investigation. Specifically, the number of teachers surveyed in 1988 was 150 and the number of students was 1202. This compared to 173 teachers and 866 students from the same nine schools in 1986. The tables reflect the percentages of responses for the GSP sample, the Middle Tennessee Region 1986 sample (MTR86), and the Middle Tennessee Region 1988 sample (MTR88).The results from the analysis of these data are included in the following tables.

TABLE T-1
CURRICULUM PERSPECTIVES

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Conceptions of Knowledge and Learning				
142. What is considered to be true or important changes as conditions change.				
Always	22	8	9	0.111
Often	63	73	72	
Seldom/Never	15	20	19	
112. Open-ended questions are confusing to students.				
Always/Often	53	72	69	1.476
Seldom	39	28	29	
Never	8	1	2	
34. It is more important that students learn what is right than to think for themselves.				
Always/Often	35	52	44	2.768
Seldom	41	39	48	
Never	24	9	8	
44. It is important for students to learn what is in the textbook.				
Always	21	15	21	2.551
Often	70	83	77	
Seldom/Never	9	2	1	
153. Information is learned primarily so it can be applied to real-life situations.				
Always	27	13	16	1.068
Often	65	82	77	
Seldom/Never	8	6	7	
66. Students learn best when new content and skills are related to their previous experiences.				
Always	59	64	55	3.933
Often	39	36	45	
Seldom/Never	2	0	1	

*p<.05

TABLE T-1 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
90. Students learn best when they begin with discrete skills and information rather than broad ideas.				
Always	18	17	8	6.877*
Often	57	63	76	
Seldom/Never	25	20	16	
156. Content is integrated across subject boundaries to promote learning.				
Always	21	10	10	0.027
Often	62	71	71	
Seldom/Never	16	19	20	
101. Students learn best when they have some choice in the selection of materials and activities.				
Always	20	8	6	0.581
Often	60	73	73	
Seldom/Never	20	19	21	
125. Students learn best when a wide variety of activities are provided.				
Always	57	42	46	1.030
Often	39	55	50	
Seldom/Never	4	2	3	
139. Given the opportunity, students will choose activities that are educationally worthwhile.				
Always	6	0	0	0.321
Often	69	68	65	
Seldom/Never	25	32	35	
<u>Expectations</u>				
52. All students are capable of higher-level learning.				
Always	16	12	13	0.377
Often	56	65	62	
Seldom/Never	27	23	25	

*p<.05

TABLE T-1 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
102. Teachers in this school expect students to learn.				
Always	74	72	72	0.564
Often	25	28	27	
Seldom/Never	1	1	1	
80. If teachers expect students to learn, students will learn.				
Always	34	19	21	0.578
Often	57	76	73	
Seldom/Never	9	5	6	
How important is it for this school to help students acquire each of the following:				
21. Reading skills				
Always	95	94	90	5.894*
Often	5	6	7	
Seldom/Never	0	0	3	
22. Factual knowledge and concepts in the subject area				
Always	79	59	63	3.161
Often	20	40	35	
Seldom/Never	1	1	3	
23. Positive attitudes toward learning				
Always	91	86	91	2.801
Often	9	14	8	
Seldom/Never	0	1	1	
24. Friendliness and respect toward people of different races and religions				
Always	85	65	70	3.715
Often	14	34	27	
Seldom/Often	1	1	3	
25. A sense of self-worth				
Always	89	84	89	1.232
Often	10	14	11	
Seldom/Never	1	1	1	

*p<.05

TABLE T-1 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
26. Critical thinking and reasoning skills				
Always	81	60	69	3.232
Often	17	38	29	
Seldom/Never	2	2	3	
27. Independence and self-reliance				
Always	81	66	70	0.562
Often	18	32	28	
Seldom/Never	1	2	2	
28. Skills in evaluating information and arguments				
Always	68	35	44	2.925
Often	29	57	47	
Seldom/Never	3	8	9	
29. Effective expression of opinions				
Always	68	32	43	4.191
Often	29	61	51	
Seldom/Never	3	7	7	
30. Vocational skills				
Always	41	20	31	6.855*
Often	40	60	47	
Seldom/Never	19	20	23	
83. Teachers feel responsible for the social development of students				
Always	27	10	7	0.996
Often	57	71	75	
Seldom/Never	16	20	17	
67. Academic learning is a top priority at this school				
Always	49	49	44	2.283
Often	44	46	46	
Seldom/Never	7	5	9	

*p<.05

TABLE T-1 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
138. There is pressure on teachers for students to get high scores on achievement tests.				
Always	14	19	41	35.165*
Often	40	42	46	
Seldom/Never	46	40	13	
77. In this school, there is a lot of pressure on students to get good grades				
Always	11	5	7	2.615
Often	54	62	69	
Seldom/Never	35	33	25	
35. Teachers pressure students to get good grades				
Always	8	6	7	1.811
Often	51	69	74	
Seldom/Never	41	25	19	
127. Achievement is more important than effort for getting good grades in this school				
Always	12	5	5	0.157
Often	54	68	66	
Seldom/Never	34	27	29	

*p<.05

TABLE S-1
CURRICULUM PERSPECTIVES

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
Self-Expectations				
1. Do you expect to graduate high school?				
A.Definitely yes	85	77	81	3.826
B.Probably	11	16	13	
C./D.I'm not sure/No	4	7	7	
2.After high school, do you expect to go to college?				
A.Definitely yes	50	29	35	9.817*
B.Probably	25	24	23	
C./D.I'm not sure/No	25	48	42	
6. How much do you expect to learn in school this year?				
A.A lot	72	62	61	0.585
B.Some	25	31	32	
C./D.Not much/Very little	3	7	7	
7. What is your favorite subject in school?				
A.Language Arts/Reading/ English	23	23	19	26.077*
B./C.Mathematics/Science	60	58	52	
D.Social Studies/History/ Geography	17	19	29	
8. If you could choose one important goal for yourself, which of the following would be the most important one for you?				
A./C.To get along with other people/To become a better person	47	46	42	4.347
B.To learn a lot about the subjects in school	18	15	16	
D.To get a good job	35	38	42	
Expectations for Me, Personally				
23. Teachers believe I can learn.				
Always	79	74	70	4.090
Often	17	20	22	
Seldom/Never	4	6	8	

*p<.05

TABLE S-1 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
75. Teachers expect me to learn.				
Always	72	68	60	17.259*
Often	24	25	29	
Seldom/Never	4	7	11	
<u>Achievement Pressure</u>				
11. Teachers count how hard we try as part of our grade.				
Always	30	27	23	8.124*
Often	44	43	43	
Seldom/Never	26	30	35	
37. Students who try hard in this school succeed.				
Always	51	42	42	5.048
Often	44	50	48	
Seldom/Never	5	8	10	
71. Teachers put a lot of pressure on us to learn.				
Always	22	17	18	10.183*
Often	41	40	33	
Seldom/Never	37	43	48	
94. Nobody cares how hard you try in this school.				
Always	9	12	12	1.550
Often	13	16	18	
Seldom/Never	78	72	70	

*p<.05

TABLE T-2
GOAL ATTAINMENT

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
How effective this school is in helping students acquire each of the following:				
Intellectual				
11. Reading skills				
Always	55	9	7	3.177
Often	40	73	81	
Seldom/Never	5	18	11	
12. Factual knowledge and concepts in the subject area				
Always	49	10	9	0.285
Often	49	80	82	
Seldom/Never	2	10	9	
16. Critical thinking and reasoning skills				
Always	30	2	5	5.193
Often	58	51	41	
Seldom/Never	12	47	53	
18. Skills in evaluating information and arguments				
Always	25	1	5	4.731
Often	58	45	41	
Seldom/Never	17	54	53	
19. Effective expression of opinions				
Always	32	3	7	3.680
Often	56	55	50	
Seldom/Never	12	42	43	
Vocational				
20. Vocational skills				
Always	21	2	4	1.887
Often	42	32	28	
Seldom/Never	37	66	68	

*p<.05

TABLE T-2 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
How effective this school is in helping students acquire each of the following:				
Personal				
13. Positive attitudes toward learning				
Always	55	5	7	1.066
Often	40	72	67	
Seldom/Never	5	23	25	
15. A sense of self-worth				
Always	53	8	11	4.871
Often	43	72	61	
Seldom/Never	4	20	28	
17. Independence and self-reliance				
Always	37	4	5	0.320
Often	52	55	54	
Seldom/Never	11	40	41	
Social				
14. Friendliness and respect toward people of different races and religions				
Always	54	12	13	3.314
Often	38	65	55	
Seldom/Never	8	23	32	
General				
111. All students have a chance to do well in this school.				
Always	72	63	59	0.772
Often	27	36	39	
Seldom/Never	1	1	2	

*p<.05

TABLE S-2
Goal Attainment

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
Intellectual				
29. In this school, we are taught reading skills.				
Always	55	54	54	2.667
Often	27	28	26	
Seldom/Never	18	18	20	
43. In this school, we are taught to read for understanding.				
Always	47	44	39	5.932*
Often	39	38	41	
Seldom/Never	14	18	20	
83. In this school, we are taught to read for enjoyment.				
Always	23	23	21	1.551
Often	41	37	37	
Seldom/Never	36	40	42	
60. In this school, we are taught how to write effectively.				
Always	37	27	29	0.846
Often	41	40	40	
Seldom/Never	22	33	32	
40. In this school, we are taught thinking and reasoning skills.				
Always	36	32	27	5.590
Often	44	40	41	
Seldom/Never	20	28	32	
Personal				
15. In this school, we are taught how to study.				
Always	33	40	37	5.035
Often	34	29	34	
Seldom/Never	33	31	29	

*p<.05

TABLE S-2 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
92. In this school, we are taught to be independent and self-reliant.				
Always	36	34	29	8.592*
Often	47	46	46	
Seldom/Never	17	20	25	
Social				
36. In this school, we are taught to respect rights of other individuals and groups.				
Always	52	48	47	4.244
Often	32	36	34	
Seldom/Never	16	16	20	
87. In this school, we are taught to be friendly toward people of different races, religions and cultures.				
Always	50	53	47	7.128*
Often	30	27	30	
Seldom/Never	20	21	23	

*p<.05

TABLE T-3
CLASSROOM PRACTICES

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Critical Thinking				
32. I encourage students to disagree with me.				
Always	16	1	3	7.902*
Often	52	42	55	
Seldom/Never	32	57	42	
58. Students are encouraged to examine different points of view rather than to expect that there are right answers.				
Always	20	5	7	0.708
Often	68	72	69	
Seldom/Never	12	23	23	
74. I encourage students to raise questions about what they are studying.				
Always	60	46	42	0.614
Often	36	47	51	
Seldom/Never	3	6	7	
Homework				
10. How much time do you expect students to spend on homework each day?				
None	12	8	12	6.091*
Less than 30 minutes	41	30	40	
More than 30 minutes	47	62	48	
Use of Textbooks				
106. I use the textbook as the primary source of information.				
Always	16	18	19	0.433
Often	51	65	66	
Seldom/Never	33	18	15	

*p<.05

TABLE T-3 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
53. I use standardized test results for making instructional decisions.				
Always/Often	43	32	45	5.930*
Seldom	39	55	48	
Never	18	12	7	
98. The tests and examinations I give my students accurately represent the goals and objectives of this school.				
Always	46	30	30	2.132
Often	51	68	64	
Seldom/Never	3	2	5	
109. I use my own teacher-made tests for making instructional decisions.				
Always	21	18	6	12.126*
Often	65	70	75	
Seldom/Never	14	12	19	
Use of Classroom Time				
38. In this school, most classes are well-organized, and little time is wasted.				
Always	43	16	24	3.181
Often	52	78	70	
Seldom/Never	5	6	6	
157. Most of the time in class is spent on academic activities.				
Always	32	28	21	2.063
Often	65	71	78	
Seldom/Never	3	1	1	
Individualization				
96. Teachers individualize instruction.				
Always	19	4	8	2.351
Often	60	69	68	
Seldom/Never	21	27	24	

*p<.05

TABLE T-3 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Student Choice Options				
93. I let students select the curriculum materials they use.				
Always/Often	21	15	11	0.933
Seldom	58	67	68	
Never	21	18	21	
104. I let students select learning activities.				
Always/Often	52	45	39	1.365
Seldom	42	52	57	
Never	6	3	4	
121. I give my students the option to do projects such as pictures or models rather than written assignments.				
Always/Often	53	48	54	1.526
Seldom	36	46	39	
Never	11	6	6	
Availability of Materials, Supplies				
97. The curriculum materials available are appropriate for the students in my classes.				
Always	46	17	19	0.618
Often	48	76	73	
Seldom/Never	6	7	9	
133. Audio-visual materials and equipment are available when needed.				
Always	63	29	37	5.612
Often	33	67	55	
Seldom/Never	4	4	8	
151. School supplies are readily available for classroom use.				
Always	44	17	19	0.536
Often	47	64	64	
Seldom/Never	9	20	17	

*p<.05

TABLE T-3 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Cooperation and Learning				
148. Students tutor or assist other students in my classes.				
Always	15	6	6	0.065
Often	56	64	63	
Seldom/Never	29	30	31	
61. I encourage students to work together on topics they are studying.				
Always	23	4	7	2.424
Often	60	72	65	
Seldom/Never	17	24	28	

*p<.05

TABLE S-3
CLASSROOM PRACTICES

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
Critical Thinking				
16. Teachers ask us to explain how we got an answer.				
Always	27	18	19	2.597
Often	54	62	58	
Seldom/Never	19	20	23	
28. Teachers encourage us to question what's in the book.				
Always	34	33	29	6.680*
Often	39	37	37	
Seldom/Never	27	30	35	
41. Teachers encourage us to raise questions about what we are studying.				
Always	46	42	40	2.910
Often	40	41	41	
Seldom/Never	14	16	19	
74. Teachers encourage us to examine different points of view rather than just find the right answers.				
Always	27	21	20	4.470
Often	49	46	42	
Seldom/Never	24	33	38	
80. We are free to question or disagree with our teachers.				
Always	38	32	27	5.594
Often	34	34	35	
Seldom/Never	28	34	38	
90. We are encouraged to express our opinions in class.				
Always	38	30	30	13.510*
Often	40	43	37	
Seldom/Never	22	26	33	
96. We spend a lot of time memorizing things.				
Always	15	10	11	4.458
Often	41	33	36	
Seldom/Never	44	57	52	

*p<.05

TABLE S-3 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
Student Choice Options				
32. We have a choice about the time we spend working on assignments.				
Always	9	10	9	3.228
Often	23	20	23	
Seldom/Never	68	71	68	
49. Teachers let us select the materials we use in class.				
Always	6	5	6	1.382
Often	24	24	22	
Seldom/Never	70	71	71	
52. We have a chance to decide what to study.				
Always	6	9	6	9.029*
Often	19	17	18	
Seldom/Never	75	74	76	
72. We are encouraged to study topics that interest us.				
Always	27	23	21	9.053*
Often	44	45	40	
Seldom/Never	29	32	39	
76. Teachers let us do projects such as pictures or models rather than written assignments.				
Always	6	4	7	12.516*
Often	29	28	30	
Seldom/Never	65	68	62	
Availability of Materials, Supplies				
67. We use different kinds of materials in class, such as newspapers and photographs.				
Always	13	7	7	0.567
Often	36	29	27	
Seldom/Never	51	65	66	

*p<.05

TABLE S-3 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
Use of Classroom Time				
9. How do you spend most of your time during the school day?				
A. Listening to the teacher talk with the whole group	67	75	70	9.049*
B. Working by myself on workbooks or reading	20	11	10	
C./D. Working with other students on special projects/Taking tests to see how much I have learned	13	14	19	
31. What we do in class is well organized and little time is wasted.				
Always	25	22	23	0.787
Often	55	51	49	
Seldom/Never	20	27	27	
77. Students fool around a lot in class.				
Always	15	18	14	9.314*
Often	33	39	37	
Seldom/Never	52	43	49	
81. I have enough time in class to finish my assignments.				
Always	16	18	15	2.617
Often	51	50	50	
Seldom/Never	33	32	34	
Homework				
5. How much time do you spend on homework each day?				
A./B. None/Less than 30 minutes	29	36	38	0.752
C. Between 30 and 60 minutes	51	46	45	
D. More than 60 minutes	20	18	17	

*p<.05

TABLE S-3 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
Individualization				
24. Everybody works on tha same things in class.				
Always	23	30	33	4.386
Often	57	51	50	
Seldom/Never	20	19	16	
Instructional Practices				
34. Most of our class assignments are interesting.				
Always	13	12	10	7.275*
Often	49	46	42	
Seldom/Never	38	42	48	
48. Teachers try to explain things in terms of other things we already know.				
Always	28	27	27	2.332
Often	54	53	50	
Seldom/Never	18	20	23	
57. Class assignments are too hard for me.				
Always/Often	16	22	22	0.237
Seldom	58	54	55	
Never	26	24	23	
91. Most of our classwork is busy-a waste of time.				
Always/Often	23	30	32	1.354
Seldom	45	44	41	
Never	32	26	27	
Use of Textbooks				
47. Most of the work in my classes comes from the textbook.				
Always	22	30	22	19.741*
Often	60	60	63	
Seldom/Never	18	10	15	

*p<.05

TABLE S-3 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
Evaluation				
4. What grades do you usually get in school?				
A.A	23	26	25	0.126
B.B	48	47	48	
C./D.C,D, or F	29	27	27	
82. We get the grades we deserve, whether or not the teacher likes us.				
Always	55	53	51	2.373
Often	32	31	31	
Seldom/Never	13	15	18	
Cooperation and Learning				
44. Teachers encourage us to work together on what we're studying.				
Always	16	17	16	6.240*
Often	37	31	36	
Seldom/Never	47	53	48	
79. There is a lot of cooperative effort among students.				
Always	22	19	19	0.588
Often	57	54	53	
Seldom/Never	21	27	28	

*p<.05

TABLE T-4
DECISION MAKING

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Response to Problems				
115. Schoolwide problems are identified and acted upon cooperatively by administrators, teachers, and other staff members.				
Always	43	22	26	0.735
Often	46	60	56	
Seldom/Never	11	18	18	
136. People in this school do a good job of examining alternative solutions to problems before deciding what to do.				
Always	35	20	22	2.519
Often	58	72	65	
Seldom/Never	6	9	14	
88. When a problem arises in this school, there are established procedures for working on it.				
Always	46	20	18	0.323
Often	45	59	62	
Seldom/Never	9	21	20	
49. Our efforts to solve schoolwide problems are successful.				
Always/Often	91	84	79	7.245*
Seldom	8	16	17	
Never	1	0	4	
Administrators' Decision Making				
50. Once decisions are made, the principal sees that they are carried out.				
Always	54	38	43	1.274
Often	40	53	47	
Seldom/Never	6	9	10	

*p<.05

TABLE T-4 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
56. Administrators seek out teachers' suggestions for improving the school.				
Always	26	8	11	2.390
Often	50	54	45	
Seldom/Never	24	38	44	
76. The principal makes the inportant decisions in this school.				
Always	34	37	37	0.797
Often	55	56	59	
Seldom/Never	11	7	5	
81. The principal accepts staff decisions even if he or she does not agree with them.				
Always	15	10	11	0.932
Often	53	48	53	
Seldom/Never	31	41	36	
114. The principal trusts teachers to use their professional judgement on instructional matters				
Always	62	49	50	0.091
Often	35	50	49	
Seldom/Never	3	2	1	
120. The principal encourages teachers with leadership abilities to move into leadership roles.				
Always	36	20	21	0.235
Often	46	49	50	
Seldom/Never	18	31	29	
Parents and Community				
86. In this school, parents and community organization work with school personnel to identify and resolve schoolwide problems.				
Always	21	1	2	3.098
Often	50	28	36	
Seldom/Never	29	71	62	

*p<.05

TABLE T-4 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
140. Parents are important members of school committees and advisory groups.				
Always	37	11	15	2.780
Often	42	30	35	
Seldom/Never	21	59	50	
General				
117. The staff evaluates its programs and activities to change them for the better.				
Always	41	19	18	0.831
Often	51	62	59	
Seldom/Never	8	19	23	
128. Overall, I have control over how I carry out my own job.				
Always	54	36	29	1.913
Often	44	64	71	
Seldom/Never	2	0	0	
154. It is difficult for teachers to influence administrative decisions regarding school policy.				
Always	9	11	13	5.382
Often	37	44	54	
Seldom/Never	53	46	33	
100. Teachers' unions or associaitions should bargain about curriculum and teaching materials.				
Always	41	59	66	1.692
Often	33	33	29	
Seldom/Never	26	8	6	
Actual and Desired Involvement in Selected Areas				
181. Do participate in hiring new teachers in this school.				
Always	9	1	0	2.091
Often	13	1	2	
Seldom/Never	78	98	98	

*p<.05

TABLE T-4 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
191. Should participate in hiring new teachers in this school.				
Always	24	11	12	5.142
Often	33	39	50	
Seldom/Never	43	50	38	
182. Do participate in selecting textbooks.				
Always	42	10	8	5.063
Often	33	44	33	
Seldom/Never	25	47	59	
192. Should participate in selecting textbooks.				
Always	57	34	30	1.458
Often	32	58	57	
Seldom/Never	11	9	13	
183. Do participate in resolving learning problems of individual students.				
Always	43	12	12	0.057
Often	44	66	65	
Seldom/Never	13	22	23	
193. Should participate in resolving learning problems of individual students.				
Always	54	35	30	1.855
Often	39	60	61	
Seldom/Never	7	6	9	
184. Do participate in determining appropriate instructional methods and techniques.				
Always	51	15	11	3.669
Often	38	61	56	
Seldom/Never	11	24	33	
194. Should participate in determining appropriate instructional methods and techniques.				
Always	62	37	35	1.358
Often	32	58	57	
Seldom/Never	6	5	8	

*p<.05

TABLE T-4 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
185. Do participate in establishing classroom disciplinary policies.				
Always	59	25	24	0.452
Often	29	55	54	
Seldom/Never	12	20	23	
195. Should participate in establishing classroom disiplinary policies.				
Always	69	48	45	0.577
Often	24	48	49	
Seldom/Never	7	4	6	
186. Do participate in establishing general instructional policies.				
Always	29	6	9	2.452
Often	44	47	39	
Seldom/Never	27	46	53	
196. Should participate in establishing general instructional policies.				
Always	42	30	29	0.377
Often	46	61	60	
Seldom/Never	12	9	11	
187. Do participate in determining faculty assignments in the school.				
Always/Often	16	8	7	2.955
Seldom	25	20	29	
Never	59	72	64	
197. Should participate in determining faculty assignments in the school				
Always/Often	37	26	24	0.455
Seldom	32	43	46	
Never	31	31	30	
188. Do participate in evaluating the performance of teachers.				
Always/Often	9	5	2	5.784
Seldom	15	17	27	
Never	76	77	71	

*p<.05

TABLE T-4 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
198. Should participate in evaluating the performance of teachers.				
Always/Often	21	13	21	3.183
Seldom	31	55	48	
Never	48	32	32	
189. Do participate in selecting adminstrative personnel to be assigned to the school.				
Always/Often	6	1	0	2.519
Seldom	10	8	11	
Never	84	91	89	
199. Should participate in selecting administrative personnel to be assigned to the school				
Always/Often	32	19	31	6.136*
Seldom	28	43	38	
Never	40	37	31	
190. Do participate in evaluating your own job performance.				
Always	37	16	17	0.082
Often	30	36	35	
Seldom/Never	33	49	49	
200. Should participate in evaluating your own job performance.				
Always	53	53	53	2.846
Often	35	42	38	
Seldom/Never	12	4	9	
Students				
116. In this school, students have a chance to change things they don't like.				
Always/Often	44	28	22	4.063
Seldom	49	68	69	
Never	7	4	9	

*p<.05

TABLE T-4 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
143. Students participate in the development of school policies, procedures, and programs.				
Always/Often	45	29	22	4.803
Seldom	47	65	67	
Never	8	5	11	

*p<.05

TABLE S-4
DECISION MAKING

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
17. We have a chance to change things we don't like.				
Always	9	9	5	10.764*
Often	28	24	26	
Seldom/Never	63	67	69	
21. Students in this school participate in developing school policies and programs.				
Always	19	14	14	0.789
Often	47	42	44	
Seldom/Never	34	44	42	
97. Teachers listen to our suggestions for program changes.				
Always	18	14	15	0.622
Often	41	37	39	
Seldom/Never	41	48	47	

*p<.05

TABLE T-5
SUPPORT SERVICES AND FACILITIES

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Library Services				
37. Library services meet the needs and interests of students.				
Always	52	11	19	5.427
Often	38	65	63	
Seldom/Never	10	24	17	
41. Library services meet the needs of teachers.				
Always	44	9	19	6.144*
Often	44	65	59	
Seldom/Never	12	26	22	
Pleasantness/Cleanliness				
134. This school building is pleasant to be in.				
Always	57	29	24	1.327
Often	38	57	61	
Seldom/Never	5	14	16	
159. The school building and grounds are kept clean.				
Always	51	19	18	0.246
Often	43	57	60	
Seldom/Never	6	24	22	
Secretarial				
64. Adequate secretarial service is available.				
Always	55	19	38	23.933*
Often	31	39	43	
Seldom/Never	14	42	19	

*p<.05

TABLE T-5 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Inservice Worthwhile				
103. Inservice programs at this school are worthwhile.				
Always	21	6	5	0.830
Often	54	58	56	
Seldom/Never	25	35	39	
Use of Building				
110. Teachers and students are allowed to put things on the walls in this building.				
Always	55	44	55	15.575*
Often	33	39	42	
Seldom/Never	12	17	3	
118. Furniture and equipment can be rearranged as desired.				
Always	77	60	65	5.935*
Often	21	33	34	
Seldom/Never	2	7	1	

*p<.05

TABLE T-6
COMMITMENT

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Indices of Student Commitment				
130. Students have a lot of school spirit.				
Always	56	19	22	2.883
Often	29	60	64	
Seldom/Never	15	22	14	
33. There is a lot of student participation in academic clubs, sports, and music and drama activities.				
Always	36	10	7	1.112
Often	42	53	58	
Seldom/Never	22	37	34	
Indices of Staff Commitment: Teacher Pride and Morale				
31. Teachers are proud to work at this school.				
Always	63	42	39	0.264
Often	34	51	52	
Seldom/Never	3	7	8	
43. The morale of teachers is high.				
Always	37	8	12	2.502
Often	50	66	58	
Seldom/Never	13	26	30	
63. Teachers maintain high standards for themselves.				
Always	53	34	31	0.398
Often	44	61	65	
Seldom/Never	3	5	5	
Indices of Staff Commitment: Teacher and Principal Openness				
40. Teachers are receptive to suggestions for program improvement.				
Always	45	28	29	0.740
Often	50	66	63	
Seldom/Never	5	6	8	

*p<.05

TABLE T-6 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
91. Teachers try new ideas to improve their teaching.				
Always	37	16	20	1.080
Often	59	79	75	
Seldom/Never	4	5	5	
145. Staff members are flexible; they are able to consider their positions on issues and change their minds.				
Always	23	11	8	3.597
Often	66	74	71	
Seldom/Never	11	15	22	
147. The principal encourages teachers to try out new ideas.				
Always	40	22	19	1.520
Often	50	61	59	
Seldom/Never	10	17	22	
122. I participate in professional development activities outside of the school.				
Always	25	17	10	3.605
Often	53	60	64	
Seldom/Never	22	24	27	
78. The principal shares new ideas with teachers.				
Always	50	20	23	6.585*
Often	41	66	53	
Seldom/Never	9	14	24	
Indices of Staff Commitment: Staff Acceptance of Responsibility				
59. Administrators, teachers, and other staff members are working hard to improve this school.				
Always	60	40	43	6.493*
Often	36	53	43	
Seldom/Never	4	7	15	

*p<.05

TABLE T-6 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
69. Rules and red tape in this school make it difficult to get things done.				
Always/Often	20	16	29	9.568
Seldom	57	74	65	
Never	23	10	5	
105. Teachers are not responsible for what happens at this school; too many factors are beyond their control.				
Always/Often	23	31	41	3.580
Seldom	47	61	52	
Never	30	8	6	
158. People in this school complain about things, but are reluctant to do anything about them.				
Always/Often	35	56	61	0.768
Seldom	54	41	37	
Never	11	3	2	
92. Teachers feel responsible for student learning.				
Always	58	48	43	7.444*
Often	40	52	53	
Seldom/Never	2	0	4	
119. The staff is task oriented; jobs get completed and there is little wasted time.				
Always	36	14	22	6.451*
Often	58	80	67	
Seldom/Never	6	6	10	

*p<.05

TABLE T-6 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Indices of Parent Commitment				
48. Parents support school activities.				
Always	34	5	6	0.871
Often	51	62	65	
Seldom/Never	15	33	29	
55. Parents serve as teacher aides in this school.				
Always/Often	37	5	15	15.322*
Seldom	27	25	34	
Never	36	69	50	
68. Parents support school rules.				
Always	27	5	4	0.431
Often	66	84	84	
Seldom/Never	7	10	12	
72. Parents work in the school library.				
Always/Often	31	8	8	5.210
Seldom	19	12	21	
Never	50	81	71	
85. Parents come to school to discuss their children's problems.				
Always	22	1	3	1.840
Often	59	54	52	
Seldom/Never	19	45	45	
95. Parents tutor students at this school.				
Always/Often	27	7	3	4.046
Seldom	36	37	44	
Never	37	56	53	
129. Parents encourage and support teachers' efforts.				
Always	21	5	1	4.533
Often	66	61	63	
Seldom/Never	13	34	36	

*p<.05

TABLE T-6 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
146. Parents make sure their children do their homework.				
Always	3	1	1	0.377
Often	59	48	44	
Seldom/Never	38	52	55	
Other Indices of Teacher Commitment				
3. On the average, the amount of time you spend per day on extra- or co-curricular duties such as music or athletics is:				
Less than 1 hr.	71	59	74	7.957*
Between 1 and 2 hrs.	18	32	19	
More than 2 hours	11	9	7	
4. On the average, the amount of time you spend per day after regular school hours checking and grading papers and preparing for class is:				
Less than 1 hr.	44	44	47	1.532
Between 1 and 2 hrs.	41	42	36	
More than 2 hrs.	15	13	17	
5. On the average, the amount of time you spend per day after regular school hours with students is:				
Less than one-half hour	65	74	79	1.854
Between 1/2 hr. and 1 hr.	25	17	16	
More than 1 hour	10	9	5	
6. On the average, the total amount of time you work per day on school-related activities is:				
Less than 8 hrs.	47	47	55	2.557
Between 8 and 10 hrs.	44	48	39	
More than 10 hrs.	9	6	6	
7. The number of teaching days you missed last year for health or personal reasons was:				
None	16	13	13	0.084
1-5	66	66	66	
More than 5	18	20	21	

*p<.05

TABLE T-6 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
8. The number of teaching days you missed last year for professional reasons was:				
None	45	51	43	4.824
1-3	47	44	55	
More than 3	8	5	2	
70. Teachers put in extra time and effort to improve this school.				
Always	56	20	19	1.772
Often	38	70	66	
Seldom/Never	6	10	15	
46. I plan to teach until retirement.				
Always	53	50	49	0.330
Often	24	30	33	
Seldom/Never	23	19	18	
137. Teachers support school policies and procedures.				
Always	49	40	39	0.379
Often	49	58	59	
Seldom/Never	2	2	3	
141. Our faculty meetings are worthwhile.				
Always	30	21	22	0.052
Often	54	64	63	
Seldom/Never	16	14	14	
144. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.				
Always	13	1	1	0.096
Often	52	30	32	
Seldom/Never	35	69	68	

*p<.05

TABLE S-6
COMMITMENT

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
Indices of Staff Commitment				
25. Teachers like to work at this school.				
Always	43	43	39	3.474
Often	45	41	44	
Seldom/Never	12	16	18	
59. Teachers in this school help out with student activities.				
Always	35	35	34	5.723
Often	51	50	47	
Seldom/Never	14	15	19	
63. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.				
Always	22	10	14	15.950*
Often	41	29	34	
Seldom/Never	37	61	52	
65. Teachers put a lot of time and effort into their work here.				
Always	49	42	43	8.927*
Often	41	44	39	
Seldom/Never	10	14	18	
84. Teachers leave the building as soon as possible when the school day ends.				
Always	10	18	16	2.071
Often	23	26	28	
Seldom/Never	67	56	56	
99. Teachers and administrators work hard to improve this school.				
Always	48	41	42	0.643
Often	37	37	36	
Seldom/Never	15	23	22	

*p<.05

TABLE S-6 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
Indices of Student Commitment				
20. I tend to watch the clock and count the minutes until school ends.				
Always	24	28	28	0.313
Often	22	28	27	
Seldom/Never	54	45	45	
45. There is a lot of student participation in academic clubs, sports, and music and drama activities.				
Always	50	36	35	14.197*
Often	34	37	44	
Seldom/Never	16	27	21	
61. The work we do in school is important to me.				
Always	46	40	38	5.214
Often	41	41	39	
Seldom/Never	13	19	24	
78. This school is a good place to be.				
Always	44	37	33	4.615
Often	38	39	40	
Seldom/Never	18	24	27	
100. Good luck is more important than hard work for success in school.				
Always/Often	20	25	31	10.916*
Seldom	26	28	29	
Never	54	47	40	

*p<.05

TABLE T-7
DISCIPLINE AND SAFETY

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Rule Enforcement				
9. On the average, how often do you report a student to the office for disciplinary action?				
Once a day/Once a week	6	6	9	1.394
Once a month	16	19	15	
Rarely or never	78	75	75	
42. Rules for students are fairly enforced.				
Always	50	32	34	0.244
Often	44	59	59	
Seldom/Never	6	9	7	
87. Student misbehavior is dealt with firmly and swiftly.				
Always	38	28	25	6.317*
Often	51	61	71	
Seldom/Never	11	11	4	
Compliance				
47. Students attend class regularly and are punctual.				
Always	38	21	19	0.427
Often	57	76	79	
Seldom/Never	5	2	2	
149. Students obey school rules and regulations.				
Always	11	5	5	4.831
Often	84	94	90	
Seldom/Never	5	1	5	
Safety/Security				
36. The building and the school grounds are safe.				
Always	60	24	26	1.405
Often	34	66	68	
Seldom/Never	6	10	7	

*p<.05

TABLE T-7 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
60. Students damage or steal other students' property.				
Always	19	18	23	1.911
Often	74	79	76	
Seldom/Never	7	3	1	
73. Students damage or steal school property.				
Always/Often	14	22	25	0.742
Seldom	73	73	69	
Never	13	5	7	
94. Students fight with each other.				
Always/Often	14	23	27	3.408
Seldom	79	76	73	
Never	7	2	0	
155. Students physically assault teachers.				
Always/Often	2	2	1	1.503
Seldom	25	35	29	
Never	73	63	69	
Student Behavior				
107. Students are taught how to behave properly so they can benefit from academic activities.				
Always	43	30	30	0.059
Often	50	65	66	
Seldom/Never	7	5	4	
School Rules				
131. School rules for students are reasonable.				
Always	69	63	49	6.596*
Often	30	37	49	
Seldom/Never	1	1	2	

*p<.05

TABLE T-7 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Drugs/Alcohol/Smoking				
39. Students violate school rules on smoking.				
Always/Often	17	20	17	3.579
Seldom	30	43	36	
Never	53	37	48	
62. Students in this school drink alcohol.				
Always/Often	20	14	17	1.695
Seldom	29	44	36	
Never	51	42	47	
113. Students in this school use drugs.				
Always/Often	12	11	8	0.685
Seldom	41	54	56	
Never	47	35	36	

*p<.05

TABLE S-7
DISCIPLINE AND SAFETY

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
School Rules				
18. Rules for students are reasonable.				
Always	39	38	36	1.900
Often	39	39	39	
Seldom/Never	22	23	26	
64. We have a say in making classroom rules.				
Always	12	11	6	16.337*
Often	21	14	15	
Seldom/Never	67	74	79	
Rule Enforcement				
46. Students know the consequences for breaking rules.				
Always	65	67	59	16.627*
Often	27	23	31	
Seldom/Never	8	9	10	
54. Student misbehavior is dealt with firmly and swiftly.				
Always	41	42	36	8.052*
Often	40	37	40	
Seldom/Never	19	20	23	
Student Behavior				
53. In this school, we are taught how to behave properly.				
Always	42	47	41	7.392*
Often	36	34	35	
Seldom/Never	22	20	24	
70. Teachers are more concerned that we keep quiet than that we learn.				
Always	11	15	14	0.503
Often	15	21	22	
Seldom/Never	74	64	65	

*p<.05

TABLE S-7 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
Compliance				
12. Students are expected to attend class regularly and to be on time.				
Always	88	90	88	3.142
Often	10	8	9	
Seldom/Never	2	2	3	
30. Students obey school rules and regulations.				
Always	12	15	11	7.844*
Often	60	56	58	
Seldom/Never	28	29	31	
88. Students obey the school rules.				
Always	13	15	13	2.248
Often	60	56	55	
Seldom/Never	27	29	32	
Safety/Security				
38. I feel safe at this school.				
Always	49	50	47	12.287*
Often	35	34	32	
Seldom/Never	16	15	22	
58. Students physically assault teachers.				
Always/Often	10	12	12	0.234
Seldom	23	21	22	
Never	67	67	66	
69. Students fight with each other.				
Always	12	15	12	6.385*
Often	26	33	33	
Seldom/Never	62	52	56	

*p<.05

TABLE S-7 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
98. Students damage or steal school property.				
Always	6	6	7	1.191
Often	16	18	19	
Seldom/Never	78	76	74	
Drugs/Alcohol/Smoking				
35. Students violate school rules on smoking.				
Always	15	18	18	6.642*
Often	17	22	26	
Seldom/Never	68	61	56	
85. Students at this school use drugs.				
Always	7	6	8	3.452
Often	17	19	21	
Seldom/Never	76	75	71	
95. Students at this school drink alcohol.				
Always	12	10	12	11.196*
Often	23	24	29	
Seldom/Never	65	66	59	

*p<.05

TABLE T-8
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Task Support				
45. There is someone in this school I can count on when I need help.				
Always	73	72	81	3.802
Often	23	25	19	
Seldom/Never	4	2	1	
51. There is a great deal of cooperative effort among staff members.				
Always	46	34	29	7.990*
Often	45	60	55	
Seldom/Never	9	6	15	
82. Teachers' accomplishments are recognized and rewarded.				
Always	32	10	13	4.072
Often	48	40	49	
Seldom/Never	21	49	38	
99. Other teachers in this school seek my assistance when they have teaching problems.				
Always	8	2	1	0.282
Often	54	54	57	
Seldom/Never	38	44	42	
124. The principal goes out of his or her way to help teachers.				
Always	47	28	41	6.733*
Often	39	56	43	
Seldom/Never	14	16	15	
160. Teachers help each other find ways to do a better job.				
Always	28	13	15	0.708
Often	60	69	70	
Seldom/Never	12	18	15	

*p<.05

TABLE T-8 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Personal Support				
65. Teachers at this school act as if things are more important than people.				
Always/Often	11	7	15	5.718
Seldom	50	71	68	
Never	39	23	17	
71. Teachers trust the principal.				
Always	51	42	37	0.838
Often	40	48	53	
Seldom/Never	9	10	10	
75. The work of students and awards are prominently displayed.				
Always	55	24	30	2.316
Often	39	63	55	
Seldom/Never	6	13	15	
79. There is an "every person for himself" attitude in this school.				
Always/Often	15	20	22	0.779
Seldom	49	63	64	
Never	36	17	14	
89. The principal is concerned about the personal welfare of teachers.				
Always	55	39	42	0.520
Often	35	45	44	
Seldom/Never	10	16	13	
152. Teachers trust each other.				
Always	36	21	20	0.152
Often	58	75	76	
Seldom/Never	6	4	3	

*p<.05

TABLE T-8 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Inclusion				
57. New teachers are made to feel welcome and part of the group.				
Always	56	52	46	2.197
Often	37	43	46	
Seldom/Never	7	5	8	
84. There is a positive "sense of community" among students, teachers, and administrators.				
Always	32	14	11	0.828
Often	53	55	59	
Seldom/Never	15	31	30	
123. Teachers from one area or grade level respect those from other areas or grade levels.				
Always	51	34	33	1.154
Often	44	59	63	
Seldom/Never	5	8	5	
132. When the principal acts as a spokesperson for this school, he or she accurately represents the needs and interests of the staff and students.				
Always	55	41	37	2.264
Often	40	53	59	
Seldom/Never	5	6	4	
135. Teachers are responsive to the concerns of parents.				
Always	49	34	32	2.227
Often	49	64	63	
Seldom/Never	2	2	5	

*p<.05

TABLE T-8 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Teachers	MTR86 Teachers	MTR88 Teachers	Chi Sq.
Respect				
54. Students insult teachers.				
Always/Often	11	13	16	2.242
Seldom	66	72	74	
Never	23	15	10	
108. Teachers and students in this school are considerate of one another.				
Always	29	13	12	0.316
Often	67	82	82	
Seldom/Never	4	5	6	
150. Teachers care about what students think.				
Always	43	32	29	5.847*
Often	54	68	67	
Seldom/Never	3	1	5	

*p<.05

TABLE S-8
Interpersonal Relations

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
Task Support				
19. Students in this school help one another.				
Always	22	22	21	4.539
Often	53	58	55	
Seldom/Never	25	20	24	
33. Teachers ignore students who aren't very smart.				
Always/Often	15	20	21	0.636
Seldom	27	27	27	
Never	58	53	52	
55. Teachers get angry when students give wrong answers.				
Always/Often	16	21	22	0.800
Seldom	48	45	43	
Never	36	34	34	
68. Students' accomplishments are recognized and rewarded.				
Always	29	18	21	3.708
Often	45	46	46	
Seldom/Never	26	36	32	
Personal Support				
10. There may be a lot of things you like about this school, but if you had to choose the one best thing, which of the following would it be?				
A. My friends	61	77	77	14.827*
B. The teachers	14	12	8	
C. The classes I am taking	25	11	15	
13. Teachers at this school act as if things are more important than people.				
Always	7	7	8	0.682
Often	16	19	18	
Seldom/Never	77	74	74	

*p<.05

TABLE S-8 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
27. Teachers are considerate of each others.				
Always	58	56	55	1.089
Often	35	36	36	
Seldom/Never	7	7	9	
56. Students are friendly toward each other.				
Always	19	22	20	6.400*
Often	65	62	60	
Seldom/Never	16	15	19	
Inclusion				
14. I know most of the other students in my grade.				
Always	57	69	69	0.252
Often	33	26	26	
Seldom/Never	10	5	5	
39. Teachers act as if they are always right.				
Always	26	29	29	5.491
Often	35	37	33	
Seldom/Never	39	34	38	
42. It is hard to get to know teachers here.				
Always/Often	19	22	22	0.124
Seldom	39	35	36	
Never	42	43	42	
51. Teachers show favortism.				
Always	18	26	23	20.729*
Often	31	38	31	
Seldom/Never	51	35	45	
86. It is hard to get to know students here.				
Always/Often	23	22	24	0.770
Seldom	43	43	44	
Never	34	34	33	

*p<.05

TABLE S-8 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
89. In general, I am satisfied with the way teachers and other adults in this school treat me.				
Always	37	33	34	3.362
Often	46	46	43	
Seldom/Never	17	20	23	
Respect				
22. Teachers treat you better if you are wealthy or your parents are "important."				
Always	8	13	13	2.750
Often	11	22	20	
Seldom/Never	81	64	67	
26. Students respect teachers.				
Always	22	26	21	6.510*
Often	53	48	52	
Seldom/Never	25	25	27	
50. Students in this school respect the rights of other students				
Always	18	22	18	6.708*
Often	53	48	49	
Seldom/Never.	29	29	33	
62. Teachers care about what students think				
Always	33	32	32	1.413
Often	47	42	40	
Seldom/Never	20	25	28	
73. Students in this school are treated fairly.				
Always	36	34	33	3.327
Often	46	44	41	
Seldom/Never	18	22	26	

*p<.05

TABLE S-8 (cont)

#Survey Item	GSP Students	MTR86 Students	MTR88 Students	Chi Sq.
93. Students are considerate of each other.				
Always	16	18	18	5.350
Often	61	60	56	
Seldom/Never	23	22	27	

*p<.05

DISCUSSION OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

The results from this study depicted in the above tables reflect the responses and the comparison of responses from teachers and students in nine schools within the University service area. Responses on these surveys between 1986 and 1988 were compared using the chi squared test to determine statistical significance. Th 0.05 level was of measurement was used as the mark for determining whether statistical significance existed between groups. The TABLEs also include the percentages from the Good Schools Project as a reference though the statistical analysis did not include computations relating to these values. The earlier study completed by these authors included the statistical comparisons between the rural group from Middle Tennessee and the Good Schools Group.

The discussion of findings is divided according to the format used by the Good Schools Project. Items relating to specific areas of interest are grouped together. Discussion is limited to items where statistical significance was determined to exist. Discussion will also be directed to the shift toward or away from the norms from the Good Schools Project.

Curriculum Perspectives

Items 90, 21, 30, and 138 showed significant changes between the 1986 and 1988 assessment for the teacher group and items 2, 7, 75, 11, and 71 revealed significant changes in the student comparisons. Inspection of these findings reveals that the 1988 teacher group moved away from the GSP norms for items 90 and 21

while moving toward the GSP norms for item 30. The most notable itm is item 138 where there is a pronounced indication from the 1988 teachers that their students should score higher on achievement tests. This seems to contradict their real interest as noted in item 30 where they show more interest in vocational skills and in item 21 where their interest in reading dropped from the 1986 assessment.

Results from item 2 from the student group indicates a positive shift in college attendance from 1986 to 1988 and there is a shift in interest from reading/language arts and mathematics/science to the social sciences shown in item 7. Students dropped in their perception of how much the teachers expected them to learn from 1986 to 1988 as shown in item 75. This same trend is supported by the results from items 11 and 71.

Goal Attainment

No significant changes were reflected in the findings for the teacher groups. There were statistically significant findings for items 43, 92, and 87 for the student comparisons. The trend away from the GSP norms was reflected in the results for each of these items with students answering more negatively in 1988 than in 1986.

Classroom Practices

Significant differences for items 32, 10 53, and 109 were found for the teacher comparisons while students changed over the two year period in their responses to items 28, 90, 52, 72, 76, 9, 77, 34, 47, and 44. The results in item 32 indicate that

teachers are more open to student disagreement in 1988 than they were in 1986. Emphasis on homework dropped toward the GSP norms as reflected in item 10. The results from items 53 and 109 indicate a shift toward teacher use of standardized tests and away from teacher-made tests from 1986 to 1988.

Results from items 28 and 90 indicate that student opinion regarding openness to discussion dropped from 1986 to 1988 while, as indicated above, their teachers perceived just the opposite. Results from items 52 and 72 reveal the same downward shift. Results from item 76 and 9 indicate a shift from emphasis on written assignments and workbooks to other types of projects. This is also reflected in items 47 and 44 where there is a shift fom the traditional textbook and individual student emphasis. Results from item 77 indicate an improvement with less fooling around in class. However, results from item 34 show student interest in class assignments to be less.

Decision Making

There were few significant changes reflected in comparisons relating to the items pertaining to decision making. Results from item 49 indicate teachers less satisfied with efforts to solve schoolwide problems while the results from item 199 indicate teachers believe more strongly they should be involved in the selection of administrative personnel. Students attitudes toward being involved in the change process also shifted downward as indicated in item 17.

Support Services and Facilities

Teachers perceived library and secretarial services to be significantly improved as indicated in items 41 and 64. Results from items 110 and 118 indicated more satisfaction with the flexible use of the building and furniture in 1988 than in 1986.

Commitment

Results from items 78 and 59 show both an upward and a lowering shift with more teachers perceiving their principal positively and more teachers showing a more negative disposition toward the principal. Fewer teachers were in the middle of the group on this response when comparing 1988 to 1986. A similar set of responses are noted in item 119. In item 69 teachers indicated more rules and red tape than in 1986 while in item 92 teachers felt less responsible for student learning than in 1986. Results from items 55 and 3 indicate more parents are serving as teacher aides and teachers are spending less time per day on extra-curricular activities.

Students responses as indicated in items 63 and 65 split in their changes with some positive and some negative changes as did the teacher group. Results from item 45 indicate a shift toward greater participation in academic clubs in 1988 than in 1986. Students lowered their ranking in terms of GSP norms on item 100 indicating good luck is more important than hard work.

Discipline and Safety

Teachers perceive school rules to be less reasonable in 1988 than in 1986 while seeing student misbehavior being dealt with

more effectively as noted in items 131 and 87 respectively. Students responded more negatively regarding school rules and enforcement of rules in 1988 than in 1986 as shown in items 64, 46, 54, 53, and 30. Students fell less safe and see more fights in 1988 than in 1986 as shown in items 38 and 69. Items 35 and 95 indicate more student use of tobacco and alcohol by their peers. (Though more rule breaking is noted, this happened at a time the rules were increased.)

Interpersonal Relations

Results from item 51 indicate teachers see less cooperative effort between staff members and item 124 shows improvement in the perception of teachers regarding their principal's willingness to help them. Item 150 reveals that teachers show less concern in 1988 about what students think than in 1986. Item 10 also indicates that students have decreased their perception of teachers as being in high regard yet results from item 51 indicate students see teachers showing less favoritism in 1988 than in 1986. Students have likewise lowered their friendliness toward other students, lowered their perception of other students respect for teachers, item 26, and lowered their respect for the rights of other students, item 50.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The number of significant differences identified in this comparison of the 1986 and 1988 assessments is much smaller than the differences found with the Middle Tennessee Group was compared to the Good Schools Group. Results from the

investigation indicate that overall little progress has been made in improving the attitudes of teacher and students in these nine schools from the original data collection until 1988. The collective data show a decided negative impact of state mandates on items describing testing programs, input into curriculum planning and teacher morale. Individual school analysis not included in this report reveals that much progress has been made in some schools while tremendous drops in attitude have occurred in other schools. Discussion of these findings with school personnel links the responses on particular items to administrative changes within the schools. These discussions tend to validate the instruments and data collection techniques.

It appears that the study which was designed at its inception to measure the impact of collaboration on rural school effectiveness has become instead a measure of the impact of state mandates and principal leadership on rural schools. On items dealing with issues addressed by state mandates, each of the schools studied tended to shift in the same direction. On items reflecting leadership initiatives of the building principal, some schools showed great improvement and others showed the opposite. This resulted in several survey items showing both positive and negative shifts away from earlier more neutral responses.

REFERENCES

Talbert, E. Gene, Richard K. Fletcher, Jr., Margaret S. Phelps. FORTY RURAL SCHOOLS: A STUDY OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS. A Research Study Presented at the 1987 Annual Meeting of the Rural Education SIG. American Educational Research Association. Washington, D. C., April 23, 1987

Frymier, Jack, Catherine Cornbleth, Robert Donmoyer, Bruce M. Gansneder, Jan T. Jeter, M. Frances Klein, Marian Schwab, William M. Alexander. ONE HUNDRED GOOD SCHOOLS. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi. 1984.